UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,081	08/20/2004	Dennis Scott Prince		5080

23971 7590 05/08/2007

BENNETT JONES
C/O MS ROSEANN CALDWELL
4500 BANKERS HALL EAST
855 - 2ND STREET, SW
CALGARY, AB T2P 4K7
CANADA

EXAMINER	
BELLAMY, TAMIKO D	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2856	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/08/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/711,081	PRINCE, DENNIS SCOTT	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tamiko D. Bellamy	2856	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 April 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-4,6-15,17,18 and 27* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-4,6-15,17,18 and 27* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-4, 6-15, 17, 18, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schatzmann et al. (5,832,411)

Re claim 1, as depicted in figs. 1, 2, and 5, Schatzmann et al. discloses positioning a sensor array (e.g., sensor units (12) including a sensor array (24)) of emission sensors (e.g., vapor sensing) in spaced relation at fixed location about a facility and monitoring changes in emission readings from the sensors (12/152) (Col. 3, lines 48-67; Col. 4, lines 1-35). Schatzmann et al. discloses monitoring changes in emission readings from the sensors and the direction of the increased emissions (Col. 9, lines 62-67; Col. 10, lines 1-17). Schatzmann et al. discloses superimposing know emission concentrations (e.g., known calibration fluid) upon the sensors (24) during a monitoring cycle to enhance the sensor sensitivity (Col. 6, lines 17-26). Schatzmann et al. discloses performing a spatial temporal emission concentration analysis to identify the source of emissions (Col. 9, lines 62-67; Col. 10, lines 1-17).

Re claim 2, as depicted in figs. 1 and 5, Schatzmann et al. discloses portable sensors (e.g., sensor units (12/152) including a sensor array (24)) (Col. 5, lines 17-67; Col 11, lines 13-24).

Re claim 3, as depicted in figs. 1, 2, and 5, Schatzmann et al. discloses positioning a sensor array (e.g., sensor units (12) including a sensor array (24)) of emission sensors (e.g., vapor sensing) in spaced relation at fixed location about a facility and monitoring the emission changes in readings from the sensors (12/152) (Col. 3, lines 48-67; Col. 4, lines 1-35). Schatzmann et al. discloses superimposing know emission concentrations (e.g., known calibration fluid) upon the sensors (24) during a monitoring cycle to enhance the sensor sensitivity (Col. 6, lines 17-26). Schatzmann et al. discloses performing a spatial temporal emission concentration analysis to identify the source of emissions (Col. 9, lines 62-67; Col. 10, lines 1-17). Schatzmann et al. discloses including data related to wind speed and direction (Col. 9, lines 62-67; Col. 10, lines 1-17).

Re claim 4, Schatzmann et al. electrochemical sensors Col. 4, lines 36-64).

Re claim 6, as depicted in figs. 1, 2, and 5, Schatzmann et al. discloses positioning a sensor array (e.g., sensor units (12) including a sensor array (24)) of emission sensors (e.g., vapor sensing) in spaced relation at fixed location about a facility and monitoring changes in emission readings from the sensors (12/152) (Col. 3, lines 48-67; Col. 4, lines 1-35). Schatzmann et al. discloses monitoring changes in emission readings from the sensors and the direction of the increased emissions (Col. 9, lines 62-67; Col. 10, lines 1-17). Schatzmann et al. discloses superimposing a gas compound (e.g., known calibration fluid) that will react with the emissions and the sensors (24/12) to isolate a signal of

emissions (Col. 6, lines 17-26). Schatzmann et al. discloses performing a spatial temporal emission concentration analysis to identify the source of emissions (Col. 9, lines 62-67; Col. 10, lines 1-17).

Re claim 7, as depicted in figs. 1, 2, and 5, Schatzmann et al. discloses positioning a sensor array (e.g., sensor units (12) including a sensor array (24)) of emission sensors (e.g., vapor sensing) in spaced relation at fixed location about a facility and monitoring changes in emission readings from the sensors (12/152) (Col. 3, lines 48-67; Col. 4, lines 1-35). Schatzmann et al. discloses monitoring changes in emission readings from the sensors and the direction of the increased emissions (Col. 9, lines 62-67; Col. 10, lines 1-17). Schatzmann et al. discloses superimposing a gas compound (e.g., known calibration fluid) that will react with a gas that causes interference and isolate a signal of emissions (Col. 6, lines 17-26). Schatzmann et al. discloses performing a spatial temporal emission concentration analysis to identify the source of emissions (Col. 9, lines 62-67; Col. 10, lines 1-17).

Re claim 8, as depicted in figs. 1, 2, and 5, Schatzmann et al. discloses positioning a sensor array (e.g., sensor units (12) including a sensor array (24)) of emission sensors (e.g., vapor sensing) in spaced relation at fixed location about a facility and monitoring changes in emission readings from the sensors (12/152) (Col. 3, lines 48-67; Col. 4, lines 1-35). Schatzmann et al. discloses monitoring changes in emission readings from the sensors and the direction of the increased emissions (Col. 9, lines 62-67; Col. 10, lines 1-17). Schatzmann et al. discloses superimposing a gas compound (e.g., known calibration fluid) that will coat the surface of the sensors (24) that make the sensors hypersensitive to

specific emissions (Col. 6, lines 17-26). Schatzmann et al. discloses performing a spatial temporal emission concentration analysis to identify the source of emissions (Col. 9, lines 62-67; Col. 10, lines 1-17).

Re claim 9, Schatzmann et al. discloses varying the superimposed emissions concentration (e.g. known calibration fluid) (Col. 6, lines 17-26).

Re claim 10, as depicted in fig. 2, Schatzmann et al. a filter (74).

Re claim 11, as depicted in figs. 1, 2, and 5, Schatzmann et al. discloses positioning a sensor array (e.g., sensor units (12) including a sensor array (24)) of emission sensors (e.g., vapor sensing) in spaced relation at fixed location about a facility and monitoring changes in emission readings from the sensors (12/152) (Col. 3, lines 48-67; Col. 4, lines 1-35). Schatzmann et al. discloses multiple redundant sensors being used to improve accuracy and identify sensors with erroneous readings (Col. 6, lines 56-65). Schatzmann et al. discloses monitoring changes in emission readings from the sensors and the direction of the increased emissions (Col. 9, lines 62-67; Col. 10, lines 1-17). Schatzmann et al. discloses performing a spatial temporal emission concentration analysis to identify the source of emissions (Col. 9, lines 62-67; Col. 10, lines 1-17).

Re claim 12, Schatzmann et al. discloses sensors (18,24) are tuned to measure different gases (Col. 4, lines 36-48).

Re claim 13, as depicted in figs. 1, 2, and 5, Schatzmann et al. discloses positioning a sensor array (e.g., sensor units (12) including a sensor array (24)) of emission sensors (e.g., vapor sensing) in spaced relation at fixed location about a facility and monitoring changes in emission readings from the sensors (12/152) (Col. 3, lines 48-

67; Col. 4, lines 1-35). Schatzmann et al. discloses providing a humidity module (20) (Col. 3, lines 60-67). Schatzmann et al. discloses monitoring changes in emission readings from the sensors and the direction of the increased emissions (Col. 9, lines 62-67; Col. 10, lines 1-17). Schatzmann et al. discloses performing a spatial temporal emission concentration analysis to identify the source of emissions (Col. 9, lines 62-67; Col. 10, lines 1-17).

Re claim 14, as depicted in figs. 1, 2, and 5, Schatzmann et al. discloses positioning a sensor array (e.g., sensor units (12) including a sensor array (24)) of emission sensors (e.g., vapor sensing) in spaced relation at fixed location about a facility and monitoring changes in emission readings from the sensors (12/152) (Col. 3, lines 48-67; Col. 4, lines 1-48). Schatzmann et al. discloses using filters (74). Schatzmann et al. discloses superimposing know emission concentrations (e.g., known calibration fluid) upon the sensors (24) during a monitoring cycle to enhance the sensor sensitivity (Col. 6, lines 17-26). Schatzmann et al. discloses performing a spatial temporal emission concentration analysis to identify the source of emissions (Col. 9, lines 62-67; Col. 10, lines 1-17). Schatzmann et al. discloses including data related to wind speed and direction (Col. 9, lines 62-67; Col. 10, lines 1-17).

Re claim 15, as depicted in figs. 1 and 5, Schatzmann et al. discloses portable sensors (e.g., sensor units (12/152) including a sensor array (24)) (Col. 5, lines 17-67; Col 11, lines 13-24).

Re claim 17, Schatzmann et al. discloses superimposing know emission concentrations (e.g., known calibration fluid) upon the sensors (24) to verify calibration.

Re claim 18, as depicted in fig. 5, Schatzmann et al. discloses providing a humidity module (20) (Col. 3, lines 60-67).

Re claim 27, as depicted in figs. 1, 2, and 5, Schatzmann et al. discloses positioning a sensor array (e.g., sensor units (12) including a sensor array (24)) of emission sensors (e.g., vapor sensing) in spaced relation at fixed location about a facility and monitoring changes in emission readings from the sensors (12/152) (Col. 3, lines 48-67; Col. 4, lines 1-35). Schatzmann et al. discloses monitoring changes in emission readings from the sensors and the direction of the increased emissions (Col. 9, lines 62-67; Col. 10, lines 1-17). Schatzmann et al. discloses superimposing know emission concentrations (e.g., known calibration fluid) upon the sensors (24) during a monitoring cycle to enhance the sensor sensitivity (Col. 6, lines 17-26). Schatzmann et al. discloses performing a spatial temporal emission concentration analysis to identify the source of emissions (Col. 9, lines 62-67; Col. 10, lines 1-17).

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims1-4, 6-10, 12 and 17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

4. The indicated allowability of claims 11, 14-15, 17, and 18 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Schatzmann et al. It is the examiners position that claims 1-4, 6-15, 17, 18, and 27 are not patentable in view of the newly applied art of Schatzmann et al. (5,832,411).

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tamiko D. Bellamy whose telephone number is (571) 272-2190. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:30 AM to 3:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hezron Williams can be reached on (571) 272-2208. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tamiko Bellamy
T.B.
May 02, 2007

HEZRON WILLIAMS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800